



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/839,103	04/23/2001	Frederic M. Newman	023	1753
7590	09/09/2004		EXAMINER	
Matthew F. Steinheimer HOWREY SIMON ARNOLD & WHITE, LLP 750 Bering Drive Houston, TX 77057-2198			KARMIS, STEFANOS	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

M

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/839,103	NEWMAN, FREDERIC M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stefano Karmis	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 May 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 26 May 2004.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-21 have been left as originally filed. Therefore claims 1-21 are under prosecution in this application.

Summary of this Office Action

3. Applicant's arguments, filed 26 May 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-21 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made. Therefore claims 1-21 are rejected and Applicant's request for allowance is respectfully denied.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

7. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Karp et al. (hereinafter Karp) U.S. Patent 6,591,242 in view of Harvey et al. (hereinafter Harvey) U.S. Patent 6,519,568.

Regarding independent claim 1, Karp discloses a method of managing billing information of a first contractor and a second contractor doing work for a company, wherein the first contractor is doing a first service operation at a job site, the second contractor is doing a second service operation at a job site, and the company has a first computer at a remote location relative to the job site comprising: transporting a second computer to the job site; providing a wireless communication link between the first computer and the second computer; using a first vehicle to facilitate the first contractor doing the fist service operation; using a second vehicle to facilitate the second contractor doing the second service operation; inputting into the second computer

first invoice data pertaining to the first service operation; inputting in the second computer second invoice data pertaining to the second service operation; and communicating the first invoice data and the second invoice data from the second computer using the wireless communication link (column 3, lines 40-59 and column 4, lines 18-59). Karp fails to teach that the job site is specifically a well site. Harvey teaches a system and method for electronic data delivery to a remote site for oilfield data (column 27, line 55 thru column 28, line 15). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the oil field data deliver taught by Harvey could include invoice data as taught by Karp for specific job sites because both are providing pertinent data from a remote site back to a host site. There is motivation to combine the teachings because it implements an efficient invoicing system that transmits data to an oilfield electronic data delivery system to incorporate invoicing at a well site.

Claim 2, the first vehicle is used in transporting the second computer to the job site (column 3, lines 1-14). Karp fails to teach that the job site is specifically a well site. Harvey teaches a system and method for electronic data delivery to a remote site for oilfield data. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the oil field data deliver taught by Harvey could include invoice data as taught by Karp for specific job sites because both are providing pertinent data from a remote site back to a host site. There is motivation to combine the teachings because it implements an efficient invoicing system that transmits data to an oilfield electronic data delivery system to incorporate invoicing at a well site.

Claim 3, displaying confirmation information on the second computer that indicates that the company has not objected to the first invoice data (column 4, lines 13-31).

Claim 4, Karp teaches entering into the second computer a first alphanumeric password that serves as a prerequisite for displaying the confirmation information (column 6, lines 50-52).

Claim 5, displaying on the second computer information that indicates that the first invoice data and the second invoice data has been made available to the first computer (column 15, lines 18-33).

Claims 6 and 7, generating a first and second electrical signal from a first and second transducer associated with a first and second vehicle; converting the signals to a digital value; storing the value and using the value to support the validity of the invoice (column 6, line 36 thru column 7, line 3).

Claims 8-12 Karp teaches job site verification system in which invoice data may be wirelessly transmitted from the job site. Karp fails to teach that the service performed is for a well site. Official Notice is taken that services at well sites are old and well known in the art. Therefore it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention that the services performed at a well site could include manipulating sucker rods and tubing, pumping fluids such as acid and cement, and downhole logging because they are common operations that need servicing at a well site.

Claim 13, Karp fails to specify that the invoice contain categories classified as consumable, nonconsumable, labor and rental. Official Notice is taken that detailed invoicing is old and well known in the art. Therefore it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Karp to include detailed billing such as consumable and nonconsumables, labor and rental because they are cost categories commonly found at well sites.

Claim 14, Karp teaches entering a job site identifier into the second computer (column 4, lines 18-59). Karp fails to teach that the job site is specifically a well site. Harvey teaches a system and method for electronic data delivery to a remote site for oilfield data. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the oil field data delivered taught by Harvey could include invoice data as taught by Karp for specific job sites because both are providing pertinent data from a remote site back to a host site. There is motivation to combine the teachings because it implements an efficient invoicing system that transmits data to an oilfield electronic data delivery system to incorporate invoicing at a well site.

Regarding independent claim 15, Karp discloses a method of managing billing information of a first contractor and a second contractor doing work for a company, wherein the first contractor is doing a first service operation at a job site, the second contractor is doing a second service operation at a job site, and the company has a first computer at a remote location relative to the job site comprising: transporting a mobile computer to a job site; using a first

vehicle to assist the first contractor doing the fist service operation; confirming that the first contractor has performed the first service operation; entering into the mobile computer approval information that indicates that the step of confirming has been carried out; displaying on the mobile computer a password of a limited useful life in response to entering the approval information into the second computer; with the aide of the password, submitting to the company first invoice data that pertains to the first service operation; and terminating the limited useful life of the password after submitting the first invoice data to the company (column 3, lines 40-59 and column 4, lines 18-59 and column 6, lines 13-67). Karp fails to teach that the job site is specifically a well site. Harvey teaches a system and method for electronic data delivery to a remote site for oilfield data. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the oil field data deliver taught by Harvey could include invoice data as taught by Karp for specific job sites because both are providing pertinent data from a remote site back to a host site (column 27, line 55 thru column 28, line 15). There is motivation to combine the teachings because it implements an efficient invoicing system that transmits data to an oilfield electronic data delivery system to incorporate invoicing at a well site.

Claim 16, approving the invoice data based on existence of the password (column 6, lines 13-67).

Claim 17, providing a wireless communication link between the home base computer and the mobile computer; and communicating the approval information from the mobile computer to

the home base computer using the wireless communication link (column 3, lines 40-59 and column 5, line 12-38).

Regarding independent claim 18, Karp discloses a method of managing billing information of a first contractor and a second contractor doing work for a company, wherein the first contractor is doing a first service operation at a job site, the second contractor is doing a second service operation at a job site, and the company has a first computer at a remote location relative to the job site comprising: transporting a second computer to the job site; providing a wireless communication link between the first computer and the second computer; using a first vehicle to facilitate the first contractor doing the fist service operation; using a second vehicle to facilitate the second contractor doing the second service operation; inputting into the second computer first invoice data pertaining to the first service operation; inputting in the second computer second invoice data pertaining to the second service operation; and communicating the first invoice data and the second invoice data from the second computer using the wireless communication link (column 3, lines 40-59 and column 4, lines 18-59). Displaying confirmation information on the second computer that indicates that the company has not objected to the first invoice data (column 4, lines 13-31). Displaying on the second computer information that indicates that the first invoice data and the second invoice data has been made available to the first computer (column 15, lines 18-33) and entering into the second computer a first alphanumeric password that serves as a prerequisite for displaying the confirmation information (column 6, lines 50-52). Karp fails to teach that the job site is specifically a well site. Harvey teaches a system and method for electronic data delivery to a remote site for oilfield data

Art Unit: 3624

(column 27, line 55 thru column 28, line 15). It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the oil field data deliver taught by Harvey could include invoice data as taught by Karp for specific job sites because both are providing pertinent data from a remote site back to a host site. There is motivation to combine the teachings because it implements an efficient invoicing system that transmits data to an oilfield electronic data delivery system to incorporate invoicing at a well site.

Claim 19, generating a first and second electrical signal from a first and second transducer associated with a first and second vehicle; converting the signals to a digital value; storing the value and using the value to support the validity of the invoice (column 6, line 36 thru column 7, line 3).

Claims 20 and 21 Karp teaches job site verification system in which invoice data may be wirelessly transmitted form the job site. Karp fails to teach that the service performed is for a well site. Official Notice is taken that services at well sites are old and well known in the art. Therefore it would've been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the Applicant's invention that the services performed at a well site could include manipulating sucker rods and tubing and pumping fluids such as acid and cement because they are common operations that need servicing at a well site.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stefano Karmis whose telephone number is (703) 305-8130. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on (703) 308-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Respectfully Submitted
Stefano Karmis
02 September 2004



HANI M. KAZIMI
PRIMARY EXAMINER